



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/765,723

01/26/2004

Mikko P. Inkinen

944-005.028

2538

4955

7590

11/27/2007

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

LEE, WILSON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2163

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/27/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/765,723

Applicant(s)

INKINEN

Examiner

Wilson Lee

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 9/10/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Perrin fails to disclose "replacing an existing character with a specific code character having information coded therein about the illegal character."

Examiner is not persuaded.

Firstly, "an existing character" has never been mentioned in the claims. It is unclear whether it refers to illegal character or not.

Secondly, as mentioned by applicant, Perrin teaches replacing invalid Win32 characters with valid Win32 characters in a requested file name. For better understanding, Examiner shows the following example, in the filename "Paper\", "\" is an invalid character for filenames because it is a functional operator. As taught by Perrin, his invention can replace invalid characters with valid characters (e.g. 1, A, etc). Then the filename could be changed to "Paper1". As seen, either invalid character "\" or valid character "1" itself represents the sixth character of the filename which its location is the sixth position within the filename. Not the fifth one or seventh. The claimed "information coded" is interpreted as "character location" in the filename which is shown in the previous office action. All information are coded, since all characters are binary coded in computers.

With regards to "information about position" of Claim 2 and "a predefined location" of Claim 8, they are both referred to the "position" or "location" in the filename. The interpretation has been explained in the previous paragraph.

With regards to the newly added limitation in claims 19 and 20, "its replacement character is an n-bit coded character having a position field", "its replacement character is an n-bit coded character having an identifier field" are an inherent feature in Perrin, or in the other prior arts because all data and characters must be represented in bits within the computer. The attached non-patent literature is selected from Computer Dictionary. Win32 is a 32 bit machine. ASCII is a 7-bit character set. The "position field" and "identifier field" are inherent feature either since the characters are located or mapped in the table, each of them has its own field in the table. See attached Appendix A.

In Claims 19, 20, "...with one group..", "with a further group.." are vague because they are not disclosed in the specification. It is not understood what group and further group are referred.

Rejections in view of Underwood and Butterfield are now withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Art Unit: 2163

In Claim 19, "with one group..", "another group.." are not disclosed in the specification to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

In Claim 20, "with a further group..", "identity..", "set of standard characters" are not disclosed in the specification to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In Claims 19 and 20, "n-bits" is vague because "n" is not specified. It could be 7 bits, 8 bits, 32 bits, etc.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perrin et al. (2004/0088153).

Regarding Claim 1, Perrin et al. discloses a mobile device (wireless network. For instance, laptop PC) (See paragraphs 0024, 0040, fig. 2) comprising including an operating system having a file system with one or more modules (fig. 2) configured for detecting (inherent feature. The illegal or invalid characters must be detected first before being replaced) a filename with an illegal character, wherein the file system comprises an encoder module for encoding the filename by replacing the illegal character with a specific code character ("by replacing invalid Win32 characters with valid Win32 characters", paragraph 0045) having information coded therein about the illegal character itself such as the character location in the filename and the information for converting back into original format (paragraphs 0004, 0045).

Regarding Claim 2, Perrin discloses that the specific code character inherently includes information about the position of the illegal character in the filename because the specific code character for replacement of the illegal character will be at the same location of the illegal character (Also see paragraphs 0045, 0051).

Regarding Claim 4, Perrin inherently discloses that the illegal characters ("invalid characters") form part of a specific list (constituted by functional operator such as "?", "+", "/", etc.)

Regarding Claim 6, Perrin inherently discloses that the specific code character includes information to identify the specific code character ("valid character", pp 0045) from other characters ("invalid character").

Regarding Claim 8, Perrin discloses that the specific code character is inherently placed in a predefined location in the filename because its location will be the location of illegal character (Also see the Response to Arguments above).

Regarding Claim 10, Perrin discloses that the file system further comprises a decoder module (emulation library) for decoding an encoded filename by replacing the specific code character with the illegal character ("by replacing invalid Win32 characters with valid Win32 characters", paragraph 0045), whereby the filename is decoded back to the original format. ("convert the file name back to the original file name)" See paragraph 0045).

Regarding Claim 15, Perrin discloses an encoder forming part of a file system of an operating system in a mobile terminal (wireless network. For instance, laptop PC) (See paragraphs 0024, 0040, fig. 2), one or more modules (fig. 2) to encode the filename having illegal character ("invalid Win32 character", pp 0045) by replacing ("by replacing invalid Win32 characters with valid Win32 characters", paragraph 0045) the illegal character ("invalid character") with a specific code character having information (character location in the filename) coded therein about the illegal character ("invalid character") itself such as the character location in the filename and the information for converting back into original format ("convert the file name back to the original file name)" See paragraphs 0004, 0045, and discussion above).

Regarding Claim 16, Perrin discloses a decoder forming part of a file system of an operating system in a mobile terminal (wireless network. For instance, laptop PC) (See paragraphs 0024, 0040, fig. 2), one or more modules (emulation library)

configured for decoding an encoded filename that was encoded by an encoder module by replaced an illegal character ("invalid character") in a filename with a specific code character ("valid character") having information (character location in the filename) coded therein about the illegal character itself, by replacing the specific code character with the illegal character ("by replacing invalid Win32 characters with valid Win32 characters", paragraph 0045), whereby the filename is decoded back to the original format. ("convert the file name back to the original file name". See paragraphs 0004, 0045, and discussion above).

Regarding Claim 17, Perrin discloses a method comprising detecting a filename with an illegal character (inherent feature. The illegal or invalid characters must be detected first before being replaced) in a file system of an operating system in a mobile terminal (wireless network. For instance, laptop PC) (See paragraphs 0024, 0040, fig. 2), encoding a filename having an illegal character by replacing the illegal character ("by replacing invalid Win32 characters with valid Win32 characters", paragraph 0045), with a specific code character having information (character location in the filename) coded therein about the illegal character itself such as the character location in the filename so as to form an encoded filename (filename comprised of valid characters) (paragraphs 0004, 0045, and discussion above).

Regarding Claim 18, Perrin discloses an apparatus comprising a means for detecting a filename (inherent feature. The illegal or invalid characters must be detected first before being replaced) with an illegal character in a file system of an operating system in a mobile terminal (wireless network. For instance, laptop PC) (See

Art Unit: 2163

paragraphs 0024, 0040, fig. 2), and a means for encoding the filename by replacing the illegal character ("by replacing invalid Win32 characters with valid Win32 characters", paragraph 0045) with a specific code character having information (character location in the filename) coded therein about the illegal character itself (See paragraphs 0004, 0045, and discussion above).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrin et al. (2004/0088153) in view of Mapping of Unicode Characters, Free Online Unicode Character Map and/or FileFormat.info. All of them are general knowledge accessible online.

Regarding Claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, as discussed above, Perrin essentially discloses the claimed invention but does not disclose the number of bits (4 bits, 8 bits, 16 bits, etc) of the Unicode character. However, it is well known to a skilled in the art that all characters in data are characterized in bits and Unicode. (See Col. 8, lines 50-67 and *Mapping of Unicode Characters, Free Online Unicode Character Map*), it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Perrin would also define the characters of the filenames in bits which depends what characters they are.

Claims 19, 20, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrin et al. (2004/0088153) in view of Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary.

Regarding Claims 19 and 20, Perrin discloses that the specific code character is an n-bit coded character since his invention is a 32 bit machine but does not explicitly disclose a position field or identifier field with one group of the n-bits. However, Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary teaches the ASCII is used in most PC systems and is 7-bit coded. Appendix A-ASCII character Set indicates a position or identifier field of each character in the table. It would have been known to a skilled in the art that Perrin is within the group of most PC systems that uses at least 7-bit coded character in the position or identifier fields.

Claims 9, 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrin et al. (2004/0088153).

Regarding Claim 9, as discussed above, Perrin essentially discloses the claimed invention but does not explicitly disclose the location (end of a main portion) of the filename before a commonly used extension. However, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art that such location (e.g. the front, middle or end of main portion) of the filename merely depends on where the invalid or illegal character locates. So, if the illegal character locates in the end, then that location will be taken as a placement for the specific code character. Therefore, Perrin can have the specific code character placed at the end of the main portion of the filename.

Regarding Claim 11, Perrin discloses that the file system receives filenames from a source and stores filenames without corrupting them (paragraphs, 0004, 0051) but Perrin does not explicitly teach that it is external. However, having an external storage means for storing filenames is well known and commonly used. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide an external storage means for storing additional filenames in order to provide more filenames and portability of the source.

Regarding Claim 12, any storage means including Perrin that converts invalid filenames into valid filenames is inherently a mass storage means since it holds lots of data.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Wilson Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-1824.

Papers related to the application may be submitted by facsimile transmission. Any transmission not to be considered an official response must be clearly marked "DRAFT". The official fax number is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Wilson Lee', is written over a horizontal line.

Wilson Lee
Primary Examiner
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office

11/26/07